

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/033,076	12/28/2001	Richard E. Smalley	11321-P012USD8	9985	
75	90 05/11/2004		EXAMINER		
Ross Spencer Garsson			HENDRICKSON, STUART L		
Suite 800 100 Congress Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Austin, TX 78701			1754		
			DATE MAILED: 05/11/2004	1	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Smaller	
Office Action Summary	Examiner 1		Group Art Unit	
	Je dide	S _N	1714	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet	beneath the co	rrespondence ac	ldress
Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	то ехріпе 3	MONTH(S)	FROM THE MAIL	ING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defa Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st 	reply within the statutory miniult, expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr	imum of thirty (30) o	days will be considere	ed timely.
Status				
★ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/3/43				
☐ This action is FINAL .				•
 Since this application is in condition for allowance exce accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 19 	pt for formal matters, pro 935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 2	secution as to 1	the merits is clos	ed in
Disposition of Claims	1 <i>d</i> =			
> Claim(s) 9 - 98 30-103 6	is/are p	ending in the appl	ication.	
Of the above claim(s)	is/are w	ithdrawn from con	sideration	
Claim(a)	is/are a		-	
X Claim(s)		is/are rejected.		
□ Claim(s)				
□ Claim(s)				r alastian
Application Papers		requirer		or election
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw	ing Review PTO-048			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on		☐ disapproved	_	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objection				•
$\hfill\Box$ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)				
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of 				
☐ received.				
$\hfill \square$ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numl	ber)		·	
 □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Num □ received in this national stage application from the In 	ternational Bureau (PCT	Rule 1 7.2(a)).	<u> </u>	
 □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numl □ received in this national stage application from the In *Certified copies not received: 	ternational Bureau (PCT	Rule 1 7.2(a)).	····	
☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numi ☐ received in this national stage application from the In *Certified copies not received: Attachment(s)	ternational Bureau (PCT	Rule 1 7.2(a)).		
□ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numl □ received in this national stage application from the In *Certified copies not received: Attachment(s) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper	ternational Bureau (PCT	Rule 1 7.2(a)).	· ·	
☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numi ☐ received in this national stage application from the In *Certified copies not received: Attachment(s)	ternational Bureau (PCT	Rule 1 7.2(a)).	· ·	on, PTO-15

Application/Control Number: 10/033,076

Art Unit: 1754

Claim 93 has an unmatched bracket.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 91-98, 100-103 and 163-182 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 91, 93, 94, etc. it is not clear how a fiber can be composed of other fibers, especially as to what is meant (aspect ratio, etc.) by 'macroscopic carbon fiber'. It is not clear if self-assembled nanotubes are meant, or whether the substructure of a carbon fiber is claimed.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 91, 93, 94-97, 100, 163-178 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Guo et al article, alone or in view of Wang article.

Application/Control Number: 10/033,076

Art Unit: 1754

The reference teaches single-wall nanotubes. The number is not taught, however Wang shows that nanotubes assemble in numbers 10 times those claimed. Therefore, it is expected that Guo makes the claimed number of nanotubes. While not teaching the claimed product exactly, where the examiner has found substantially the same product as claimed in the art, the burden is upon the applicant to show a difference; In re Fitzgerald et al. 205 USPQ 594.

In so far as the rejection is under '103, then it is noted that the quantity of a material does not impart patentability; In re rose 105 USPQ 137.

The further description/intended use does not limit the claimed product; if significant non-nanotube structure is claimed, then the added/amended claims are subject to restriction. The dopant of claim 167 is deemed met by catalyst particles expected to be present.

Claims 98, 101-103, 179-182 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guo et al., alone or in view of Wang, and taken with applicants' admissions in the specification and Fishbine.

The above does not teach the additional materials, however applicant indicates on specification pgs. 30, 27, 48, etc. that the coaxial cable, composites, etc. are old and known; applicant has a new filler. Fishbine indicates in the opening paragraphs that carbon nanotubes have particular properties and is taken to be representative of the known uses of nanotubes. The examiner takes Official Notice that the claimed structures of these dependent claims are old and known, nothing that there is nothing in the specification to indicate otherwise.

Using the nanotubes in a composite or manner claimed is an obvious expedient to exploit their emitter, conductive and other properties.

Art Unit: 1754

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (571) 272-1351.

Stuart Hendrickson examiner Art Unit 1754